

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 4109 of 1996

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE M.S.PARIKH

=====

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement?
4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge?

RATUBHA JASUBHA ON BEHALF OF DENT.RANJISINH JASUBHAI RATHOD

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:

MS. MEETABEN PANCHAL for MR VH DESAI for Petitioner
MR KC SHAH, AGP for Respondents.

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE M.S.PARIKH

Date of decision: 09/09/96

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. By way of this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India the petitioner, brother of the detenu-Ranjitsinh Jasubha Rathod, has brought under challenge the detention order dated 6/4/1996 rendered by the respondent no.2 u/S. 3(1) of the Gujarat Prevention of Anti-Social Activities Ac, 1985 (Act No. 16 of 1985), hereinafter referred to as 'the PASA Act'.

2. The grounds on which the impugned order of detention has been passed appear at Annexure-B to the petition. They inter-alia indicate that the detenu by himself and with the aid of his associates has been carrying on criminal and anti-social activities of storing and selling country liquor and following prohibition offences have been registered in the Kodinar Police Station against the detenu :-

- 1) CR 502/94 U/s. 65F of Bombay Prohi. Act
75 litres of fermentation valued at
Rs.375/-. Pending in Court.
- 2) CR 534/94 U/Ss.66B,65E of Bombay Prohi. Act
20 litres of country liquor valued at
Rs.630/-. Pending trial.
- 3) CR 18/95 U/S. 65 F of Bombay Prohi. Act
75 litres of fermentation valued at
Rs.375/-. Pending trial.
- 4) CR 44/95 U/s. 65 f of Bombay Prohi. Act
75 litres of fermentation valued at
Rs.375/-. Pending in Court.
- 5) CR 119/95 U/s. 65 f of Bombay Prohi. Act
180 litres of fermentation valued at
Rs.960/-. Pending in Court.
- 6) CR 172/95 U/s. 66B, 65C, D, E & F of Bombay Prohi.
Act. 675 litres of fermentation valued at
Rs.4025/-. Pending in Court.
- 7) CR 186/95 U/s. 65 f of Bombay Prohi. Act.
75 litres of fermentation valued at
Rs.400/-. Pending in Court.
- 8) CR 200/95 U/s. 65 f of Bombay Prohi. Act.
180 litres of fermentation valued at
Rs.580/-. Pending in Court.
- 9) CR 222/95 U/s. 66B, 65E of Bombay prohi. Act
8 litres of country liquor valued at
Rs.240/-. Pending in Court.
- 10) CR 242/95 U/s. 65F of Bombay Prohi. Act.
375 litres of fermentation valued at
Rs.2,000/-. Pending in Court.
- 11) CR271/95 U/s. 65F of Bombay prohi. Act
180 litres of fermentation valued at

Rs.948/-. Pending in Court.

- 12) CR 405/95 U/ss. 66B,65E,F, D of Bombay Prohi. Act
20 litres of country liquor and 120
litres of fermentation and articles for
purification of liquor valued at
Rs.1270/-. Pending in Court.
- 13) CR 488/95 U/s. 65F of Bombay Prohi. Act
150 litres of fermentation valued at
Rs.800/-. Pending investigation.
- 14) CR 550/95 U/ss.66B, 65C,D,G, F of Bombay Prohi. Act
375 litres of fermentation and 10 litres
of country liquor and muddamal articles
for purification of liquor valued at
Rs.2665/-. Pending investigation.
- 15) CR 173/96 U/s. 65F of Bombay Prohi. Act
225 litres of fermentation valued at
Rs.1200/-. Pending investigation.

3. It has been recited that the detenu's anti-social activity tends to obstruct the maintenance of public order and in support of the said conclusion statements of five witnesses have been relied upon. They indicate about incidents of 1995. These incidents indicate abusing and beating the witnesses and creating atmosphere of fear amongst them.

4. It is on the aforesaid incidents that the detaining authority has passed the impugned order of detention while also relying upon the aforesaid cases lodged against the petitioner. The petitioner has been stamped as a 'boot-legger' within the meaning of section 2(b) of the PASA Act.

5. I have heard the learned advocate for the petitioner and the Ld. A.G.P. for the State. The petitioner has challenged the aforesaid order of detention on number of grounds inter-alia on the ground that there is no material to indicate that the detenu's conduct would show that he is habitually engaged in the anti-social activities which can be said to be prejudicial to the maintenance of public order. This is a case of individual incidents affecting law and order and in the facts of the case would not amount to leading to conclusion that the same would affect public order. Reliance has been placed on the following decision of the Apex Court :-

Mustakmiya Jabbarmiya Shaikh v/s. M.M. Mehta,
C.P. , reported in 1995 (2) G.L.R. 1268, where
the incidents were quoted in paras: 11 and 12 of
the citation and it has been submitted that facts
of the present case run almost parallel to the
facts before the Apex Court in Mustakmiya's case
(supra).

6. As said by the Apex Court in the case of
Mustakmiya (supra) there is a marked difference between
the detenu's conduct showing that he is habitually
engaged in anti-social activities which can be said to be
affecting law and order situation and the detenu's
conduct showing that he is habitually engaged in the
anti-social activities, which can be said to be
prejudicial to the maintenance of public order. On
comparing the facts before the Supreme Court with the
facts in the present case, this is clearly a case of
individual incidents affecting law and order and in the
facts of the case, the detenu's conduct would not amount
to leading to a conclusion that the same would affect
public order.

7. In reply Mr. K.C. Shah, Ld. A.G.P. for the
State has relied upon a decision in the case of Mrs.
Harpreet Kaur Harvinder Singh Bedi v/s. State of
Maharashtra and anr., reported in AIR 1992 SC 979.
Comparing the facts of the present case with the facts in
the case before the Supreme Court, it clearly appears
that the decision in Mrs. Harpreet Kaur's case (supra)
would not be applicable.

8. There are other grounds of challenge levelled
against the impugned order of detention. However, in
view of the fact that the petitioner would succeed
directly on the strength of decision of Mustakmiya's case
(supra), it is not necessary to deal with the other
grounds. Hence, following order is passed :-

9. The impugned order of detention is hereby quashed
and set aside. The petitioner-detenu-Ranjitsinh Jasubha
Rathod shall be forthwith set at liberty if he is not
required to be detained in any other case. Rule made
absolute accordingly.

* * *

